REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-20 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0057265 to Tamura et al. ("Tamura") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0212610 to Hamlin ("Hamlin").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind Hamlin. Amended claim 1 includes, in part, the following: "execute a software driver for a display codec, the software driver configured to format data in a first display codec into a first video format and format the data in a second display codec of a plurality of display codecs into a second video format, wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when the first display codec is changed to the second display codec; and transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display using the software driver."

Tamura discloses a display unit 502 consisting of a liquid crystal panel 110 and display driver IC 512 (Figure 8). More specifically, Tamura discloses that "the display driver … to supply text data as the display data or to set the moving image display region and the still image display region."(paragraph [0200]). In particular, Tamura discloses that the display driver

decodes the video data and writes the decoded data into the display data RAM (paragraph [0215]). Further, the portion of Tamura cited by the Examiner discloses that "the display data...has been written in each frame, the display data to be read can be with certainty the new display data in the frame."

The Examiner noted that Tamura fails to disclose "remaining in a default configuration."(Office Action, p. 8).

As set forth above, Tamura discloses the display driver that supplies new display data. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to controlling a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and controlling a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, while remaining in a default configuration when using of the first display codec is changed to using of the second display codec.

Furthermore, Tamura fails to disclose transmitting the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and transmitting the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Hamlin, in contrast, discloses a video driver that remembers a previous display configuration, and restores that display configuration when returning to that display. (paragraph [0036]). In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to a software driver configured to control a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and to control a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when using of the first display codec is changed to using of the second display codec, and configured to transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Hamlin and Tamura were combined, such a combination would still lack a software driver configured to control a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and to control a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when using of the first display codec is changed to using of the second display codec, and configured to transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tamura in view of Hamlin.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the similar reasons as set forth above, claims 2-3, 6-10, and 15-19 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tamura in view of Hamlin.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura and Hamlin in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0104899 to Swartz et al. ("Swartz").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind Swartz.

Swartz, in contrast, discloses a real time stream processor. Swartz fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a software driver configured to control a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and to control a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when using of the first display codec is changed to using of the second display codec, and configured to transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Tamura, Hamlin and Swartz were combined, such a combination would lack a software driver configured to control a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and to control a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, <u>wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when using of the first display codec is changed to using of the second display codec</u>, and configured to transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claim 4 depends from amended claim 1, and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tamura and Hamlin in view of Swartz.

Claims 5, 11-14, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura and Hamlin in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0155043 to Schulz et al. ("Schulz").

Applicants reserve the right to swear behind Schultz.

Schulz, in contrast, discloses remotely monitoring and controlling machine. Schulz fails to disclose, teach, or suggest aforementioned limitations, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Tamura, Hamlin and Schulz were combined, such a combination would lack a software driver configured to control a first display codec that formats data into a first video format and to control a second display codec that formats data into a second video format, <u>wherein the software driver remains in a default configuration when the first display codec is changed to the second display codec</u>, and configured to transmit the data having the first video format from the first display codec to a first display and to transmit the data having the

second video format from the second display codec to a second display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 5, 11-14, and 20 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 11-14, and 20 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tamura and Hamlin in view of Schulz.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 18, 2009   By: /Tatiana Rossin/
                                 Tatiana Rossin
                                 Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300

Customer No. 045209